

---

Mobilising the German Mind

Author(s): Charles Edward Lyon

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Apr., 1917), pp. 385-409

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738211>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:26 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

# THE JOURNAL OF RACE DEVELOPMENT

---

Vol. 7

APRIL, 1917

No. 4

---

## MOBILISING THE GERMAN MIND

*By Charles Edward Lyon, Ph.D., Professor of German,  
Clark College*

In gathering together the very extensive library of war literature the Clark University authorities have wisely given their foreign purchasing agents a free hand. While this may mean that a great many books of little merit may find a place on the shelves, at the same time it makes it possible to obtain some of the books that will be exceedingly hard to find after the war. Then again, all is grist that comes to the psychologist's mill, so that no pamphlet, however brief, is insignificant, if only it be the output of a mind working at the white heat that the war produces. Shrewd reading between the lines of such a pamphlet is apt to reveal more than many a volume of denatured chronicle of war.

It is especially fortunate that the German shipments are large. The French and the British character are fairly patent to the American; their *Weltanschauung* and their reflexes are enough like our own to prevent them from seeming complex. As regards the German, we might have ventured a few years ago to believe that we had partaken very liberally of German culture, that is, of Schiller's idealism, of Goethe's broader humanity, of Kant's deep concept of duty, and had seasoned our repast sufficiently with Heine's sprightliness to prevent the repast from becoming insipid through the sugar and watery dilution of sentimentality and romanticism, in other words, that we had read, marked and learned German until it had become fully digested and had made its due contribution to our own *Weltanschauung*. So we might have thought until the

war came and brought with it the discovery, in the realms of thought, of whole continents like Nietzsche and Treitschke, of insular Chamberlains and Bernhardis and numberless Rivers of Doubt and other uncharted waters. These unexplored recesses of the German mind have now become revealed—and yet he would indeed be a self-confident person who would declare that he is not considerably perplexed to account for most of the German reactions, either as a nation or as individuals, to the stimulus that the war has provided.

I am aware that just now the great mass of Americans will be disinclined to read further, inasmuch as they feel competent to account for the German in the words of the Psalmist: "They have done abominable works; there is none that doeth good among them, no, not one." Regardless of the fact that a whole nation cannot be thus covered with a blanket indictment, it is still worth while to push this investigation further, if only for the intellectual satisfaction of having come somewhat nearer the truth of the situation. There can be nothing definitive about such a study, of course, as too little of the evidence is at hand. But inasmuch as it is my object to make a sort of empirical study of the mobilisation of the German mind, from a narrow range of observation, without any warrant for the exactitude of the study or its wider validity, it is important to examine whatever material we have at this stage of the war, just as the experimenter in the laboratory must take readings of the thermometer at all stages of his experiment.

The Ante-bellum German has now been so exhaustively written up, both by friend and foe, that nothing new remains to be said. There is something grimly humorous about the eleventh-hour revision which some of the Teuton's opponents had to make in their estimate of his character—an estimate that had its sources in the Pumpernickel and Teufelsdröckh conceptions, in the idyllic days of the Prince Consort, and which continued throughout the commonplace and highly moral Victorian age, even beyond the days of Bismarck's insolence to "the Englishwoman," the Empress Frederick. Perhaps Carlyle's en-

thusiasm over "noble, patient, deep, pious and solid Germany, welded into a nation" which should some day "become queen of the continent" was regarded as hero-worship rather than prophecy. Then on the other hand, taking the ante-bellum estimate of his character as conceived by the German himself, there is something more than grimly humorous, rather something sardonic and tragic in the way that this master-mechanic of the mind fashioned a creature of the mind so perfectly coördinated and articulated that it actually came to life and turned on its maker to rend him. It is as if the German Pygmalion had fashioned a soldier instead of a lovely woman and then Mars instead of Aphrodite had brought it to life. Or rather it reminds one of the scene in "Faust" wherein the whimpering poodle that Faust had befriended was suddenly transformed into the leering shape of the devil himself. And so in 1914 it required only the spell of the magic word "mobilise" to convert the simple peasant Michel, with his scythe, into the semblance of Michael the archangel, equipped with a sword of flame to attack Lucifer and his fellow evil-doers (to quote the interpretation of *Das Buch Michael*, a book recording the reactions of German children to the war).

The assembling of the German army in August, 1914, was without question the most marvelous "stunt" of the sort ever witnessed. It amazed even the German stay-at-homes, to judge from the constant references in the war pamphlets to the clock-like precision with which this huge mechanical toy began to operate. Few realized, as the last Pickelhaube disappeared in the direction of the Rhine or the Vistula, that another and equally marvelous mobilisation, that of the German mind, got under way. The authorities could have had but few qualms lest the mechanical side of the performance run off smoothly; but their fervent and oft-repeated thanks that all Germany is united in its support of the Fatherland betray to the initiated the anxiety and the misgivings with which officials looked forward to the working-out of the far more difficult and delicate half of their program. "Out of sight, out of

mind" would mean ruin; "flaming enthusiasm," they said, "would mean success." Looking at the matter neutrally and leaving moral considerations aside, their performance was a most impressive one, one that repays study, even with the rather meagre data at hand. I shall try to outline the share of the poet, the professor and the preacher in this mobilisation of the German mind.

*The poet's share.* Apparently it is a principle of German literary production that the value of the output varies inversely with the welfare of the state. The glorious classic period of Herder, Lessing, Schiller and Goethe hardly got under way during the triumphant years of Frederick the Great but reached its height just at the time that Prussia was in her deepest degradation under the heel of Napoleon. Again, at the height of Bismarck's influence, the German arts, particularly the theater, reached an apallingly low ebb. But Bismarck's dismissal was coincident with the emergence of the new school of Naturalism headed by Hauptmann and Sudermann. While these two have never fulfilled their early promise, they inspired such a great number of poets, at about the turn of the century, that the German critics began to acclaim a new school of Classicism. Since about 1905 there has been much to warrant these high hopes. Hauptmann's *Bow of Odysseus* may not rank very high as a classic but the spirit behind the work is very significant. The author has longed for Greece as ardently as Goethe for Italy. He says in *Grecian Spring-time* (1907): "Never has there come from the earth a force, a charm like unto that which fills me with such rapture here." The spirit behind these words, the same that has animated some of the best writing of Friedrich Lienhard and Hofmannsthal, is the same humane, cosmopolitan spirit that was back of the earlier classic period. A quotation from Lessing is in point: "The praise of a zealous patriot is the last which, according to my way of thinking, I should desire to win; a patriot, that is, who should teach me to forget that I ought to be a citizen of the world." (From a letter to the poet Gleim.) "They are but Goths that know not Goethe," said Schiller. Such cosmopolitanism is any-

thing but conducive of patriotism. Literary schools in Germany have a semi-official character. Prizes are bestowed, with the approval of the emperor, upon those who are adjudged to have done the most for the cause of German letters; royal favors of other kinds are conferred upon those whose literary effusions redound to the greater glory of the State. Naturally, then, a classic revival, with its broad, cosmopolitan, politically neutral spirit would not find the atmosphere of Berlin very congenial. Hence it is that many of the leaders formulated the slogans that led many minor poets to rally to them: "Los von Berlin!" "Mehr Goethe," "Wege nach Weimar," "Wo Lärm ist, da kehr' um!" At the outbreak of the war, seven out of nine of the most prominent literary journals were published elsewhere than in the capital. Further evidence of the waning influence of Berlin might be seen in the "Heimatkunst" movement among the literary cliques, a "back home" movement that might seem patriotic enough to the Bavarian or Swabian but which must have impressed some Prussians as parochial.

Then came another trend, a later and more powerful one, that ran directly counter to the decentralizing tendencies. Prince von Bülow says it was found necessary in the ten years following Bismarck to harp on the string of Nationalism. In the last decade before the war this "harping" has been taken up by the whole orchestra. A great deal has been made of anniversaries, in particular of the centenaries of political events and patriotic authors. The centenary of Schiller's death, in 1905, brought out an enormous literature that naturally emphasized the patriotic note. "Wilhelm Tell" was performed 412 times that year throughout the Empire. At the Kleist centenary in 1911 ample amends were made for the slight esteem in which his contemporaries had held him. Again the dominant note was the patriotic one, only somewhat more in keeping with the times, inasmuch as Kleist was a most intense Prussian, almost the official apologist of the Hohenzollern house. "Down with all enemies of Brandenburg!" the last line of his "Prinz von Homburg," offset in six

words much of the dreamy New Idealism defined by one of its devotees as the "harmonious expression of ideals, guided rather by thought than feeling and expressive of symmetry, repose and concentration."

This New Idealism was beginning to "lose out," the minds of Germans were already beginning to mobilise. The armed neutrality stage was reached in the 1913 celebration of the centenary of the defeat of Napoleon at Leipzig. The literary expression of this fateful occasion was entrusted to Gerhart Hauptmann. His cue was evident enough. When he ignored it and chose rather to portray Blücher and Scharnhorst as human beings and Frederick William III as a decidedly weak individual, the storm broke. The Crown Prince, royal patron of the Festspiel, withdrew it from the stage after one performance. A little later Hauptmann drew another storm upon himself when he ventured to revise Schiller's "Tell." It became manifest that the public now regarded the original text as plenary inspiration, that the bold words of defiance in the mouths of the mediaeval Swiss were no longer classified as mere literature but had been transmuted into a state policy. The mental preparedness was almost complete; only one thing more was needed, that the will-to-fight be given direction, a tangible objective. It was at this point that the "perfidious Albion" motif, so often sounded on Treitschke's clarion trumpet, was taken up fortissimo by the brasses and kettle-drums of the professorial orchestra. To indicate the part played by the critic, I quote from a *History of Nineteenth Century Literature* by Professor Meyer of the University of Berlin:

There is nothing of much importance just now in English drama except for the work of Bernard Shaw. And Shaw's plays are built up on French technique, pieced out with epigrams and aphorisms from German sources. The English have let the drama become atrophied rather than rejuvenate it; German predominance in this field is unquestionable. . . . In German novels the characters evolve, expand; they are not lay-figures for superficial, conventional treatment, as is the case in *Pride and Prejudice*, accounted by many Englishmen to be their best novel. Goethe wrote the first modern novel and the Germans still hold the lead. . . . But it is in the field of poetry



that the superiority of the Germans is most conspicuous. For they are the only nation that comprehends the changed relation of the poet to his theme and to his public. English poetry is written by gentlemen for the delectation of gentlemen if he transgresses the laws of propriety in verse a poet forfeits his rating, even though he be George Noel Lord Bryon. The Germans appreciate poetry more than other nations; Bryon, Burns, Béranger Verlaine, Verhaeren find more ardent admirers here than in their own countries. . . . Taken altogether, no literature is of so nearly world-calibre as the German. . . . English literature is the only islet of the old conservatism not submerged by the deluge of progressive modernism. Oscar Wilde, using literature as a stepping-stone to social recognition, is typical. Walter Scott was the only Britisher to reach the common man. German lyric poetry is lyric and musical; English poetry just the opposite. To be sure, Burns, Keats, Tennyson and Swinburne are musical but Burns is Scotch and the others are cosmopolitan and not typically English. Hardness of heart and stupid insularity are dominant English characteristics. I do not believe that another such instance of utter lack of appreciation of cultural values exists as that evidenced in their attitude toward German literature. They prefer to remain ignorant, but they will not be able to hold out long, for their civilization is in process of a readjustment that brings it constantly nearer our own.

This appeared in 1913 while the celebration of the defeat of Napoleon was at its height. At the same time the publishers flooded the market with popular illustrated booklets of the *Freiheitsjahr*, anthologies of patriotic poetry, and selections from the writings of Fichte, Kleist and other heroes of a century ago. While the purport of these booklets was in all probability honest enough, their effect was merely to add fuel to the flames kindled by the Pan-German doctrine and by the critical situation in the diplomatic world.

The order "mohil machen" threw the German mind at once into fever heat. The poets and pamphleteers mobilised by the million, armed with fountain-pens, a weapon of the mobilisation period far mightier than the officer's sword. In his keynote speech of August 1 the emperor declared that the other nations were plotting against Germany, that the fight was a purely defensive one for the Fatherland and that ultimate victory would crown their efforts, provided all were united. In other words, he directly implied that the conditions that had once resulted,



through German unanimity, in the glorious year of Freedom, 1813, the memory of which had so thrilled German hearts and minds in the last twelvemonth, were now once more confronting them all. The resultant solidarity and religious exaltation showed that the emperor was a master of the principles of mob-psychology. A deluge of poems and pamphlets followed the speech. Julius Bab, one of the most prominent critics, estimates that between August and February one and a half million poems were turned out. One Berlin newspaper announced that it received "far more than five hundred poems a day." Julius Bab himself, as editor of an anthology, received twelve hundred effusions per month.

The German critics were under no illusions as to the literary merit of this outpouring. They regarded it properly as a psychological phenomenon. The newspapers printed what they could until the news from the front made more urgent demands upon their space. Thereupon those who could arrange to do so gathered their effusions into book form. Quite a large number of these volumes have arrived in this country. After having read a couple of hundred of the poems I feel quite convinced of my thesis that the Germans have unconsciously transferred to the present war the reaction primarily incited by the celebration of the war against Napoleon, when the Prussians *were* cruelly treated, when they *were* the victim of an invasion and when unanimity and splendid bravery *did* result in their ultimate triumph. A 1914 will-to-fight, so artificial, on such insecure, even immoral grounds as this could not have survived the first frenzy. We shall see in the next section of this paper how the super-professors and the professors-in-ordinary converted the potentialities of this will-to-fight into the immensely important factor that it now represents.

As I have said, nobody in Germany was deluded into thinking that there was any value in the poetic effusions and letter-writing of the million Pro Bono Publico's and Veritas's. The literary critics exposed the utter lack of form and showed that the deluge of printed matter should

be regarded chiefly as an interesting chapter in mob-psychology. Every citizen of the nation of poets and dreamers, thinkers and idealists, understood that a more nearly official explanation of Germany's position would follow later on in the ex cathedra utterances of the professors throughout the Empire, particularly of the super-professors at the University of Berlin, speaking from the same platform from which Fichte and Treitschke had spoken when they held their audiences spellbound.

This professorial artillery was unlimbered at about the time that the field-artillery was unlimbered outside of Antwerp. Foreign countries had also been waiting for the semi-official explanation and we can all recall the surprise, not to say shock, occasioned by the document issued by a hundred German professors, headed by such distinguished men as Eucken, Harnack and Kühnemann, and addressed to their academic colleagues in France and England. We are now more interested in the speeches intended for home consumption, preëminently in those delivered by the Berlin professors. The first one was delivered by Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on August 27, 1914. Eleven other professors, including Delbrück, von Harnack, Kipp and Franz von Liszt, treated the war from various standpoints, the series concluding on November 18, 1914. Thereupon the whole series was published in book form as *Deutsche Reden in schwerer Zeit*, Heymanns, Berlin (350 pages). The preface shows the value attached to them:

German history will contain no more splendid pages than those telling of the first triumphant weeks. All concern was banished by the enthusiasm that held all classes of the people in its grasp: "How happy are we that we are Germans!" Then matured the plan to publish this book. The enthusiasm must be maintained, must be spread out over a time when every day does not bring news of fresh victories, when "hold on" will have to be the watchword, when joy over victories will be diluted by laments over the dead and gone, when the exigencies of existence might weaken the hope of ultimate victory. . . . In a word, these speeches must serve to reveal an inexhaustible source from which courage, hope and confidence may ever be renewed. . . . Thousands have heard these speeches, every class of

the people was represented and every hearer carried away a recollection of the lofty mood, even inspiration, that animated the speakers. In the addresses lives the spirit of these times. They are testimony to the fashion in which the German people accept the war. In them flame all the anger and passion of the day.

We are by this time tolerably familiar with the viewpoint of the professors. However, I translate freely a few quotations in order to uphold the general thesis of this paper.

From Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: *How the War Began*: How our hearts have been elevated by what this war has revealed! Among us a spirit of concord. . . . And what has been revealed in the Belgian soul except the spirit of cowardice and assassination? . . . . No moral forces operate in them, hence they reach for the torch and the dagger. . . . We are sorry for the poor Russians who are led to the slaughter, they know not why or wherefore. . . . But we are a free people, we are obedient because we know what we are fighting for. . . . The French have been forced into the fight by their ruling classes, who mislead the people chiefly to continue their mastery over them. . . . And England! There is the real evil spirit that has summoned this war up from hell, by reason of her spirit of envy and hypocrisy. . . . We did not want this war. . . . Since we were forced into it, since every one knows that it was not our making, that is why we all stand united, trusting in our right, our good cause, our honesty of purpose.

From Roethe: *We Germans and the War*: We did not want or seek this war. We have peaceably submitted to so much that for that very reason our enemies, not understanding our patience, suspected a trick . . . . and now we are brutally and insolently attacked, even where we seem to be the aggressors. . . . England would fain see us reduced to an aggregation of little states. But the right that Fichte demands for every state that has any right to existence, the possibility of developing, of realising our ideals, all this England is unwilling to permit and so we must fight our way through, in order that we shall not perish. . . . Today every German renders thanks that Prussian sense of discipline, or orderliness, of fulfilment of duty permeates the German army, a sense of duty intimately associated with love and allegiance to the supreme war-lord. . . . How we love our wonderful army! How it unfolds all the highest virtues of the nation! "Good fellows" our soldiers have been called and the term fits, so generous are they, so big-hearted and withal so naïve. To be sure, I do grant that occasionally a Bavarian may bring down the butt of his musket more forcibly than an English or French skull might approve. But it is the bitter duty of our soldiers thus forcibly to punish the infamy of assassins. But their natural good nature asserts itself quickly. We have learned how German soldiers offer a refreshing draught

to the prostrate foe who had tracherously shot at them. We see how universally they respect the defenselessness of women and children. We read with emotion how our boys, whose culture is genuine and not a mere cloak, as is the case with our enemies, saved the beautiful City Hall in Louvain from the destruction that the rabid population sought to wreak. Perhaps nothing distresses us Germans today so much as the fearful untruthfulness of our opponents. They lie for various reasons and in various ways. The Russian is the most harmless; he lies stupidly and brutally. The Frenchman must lie to deceive himself, lest his élan vanish. But the English lie systematically, cold-bloodedly, deliberately. . . . The lie is contrary to German nature. Even Bismarck gained his greatest diplomatic triumphs by telling the truth in a frank manner that no English or French diplomat would have thought possible.

From Otto von Gierke, *War and Civilization*: There is not one among us who does not know that this war was forced upon us. . . . Now we want the war, want it in all its power and magnitude. Neither fear nor pity shall weaken our arm until the host of enemies is defeated. We share none of the blame for the breach of the peace; with a clean conscience we exercise our right to self-defense. We hail the war as salvation sent by divine dispensation. For a righteous war does not only destroy values; it also creates them. . . . War has always swept away that which was ripe for destruction. . . . The world has nursed the illusion that this nation was forever fated to play the role of the Cinderella among the nations. Fichte told us a hundred years ago that our nation was called to perpetuate culture for the world and hence owed it to itself to preserve itself.

And so on, at great length. It ought not to be necessary to quote further from this book, or from *Die Deutsche Erhebung von 1914* by Friedrich Meinicke (of the University of Berlin) 8 *Addresses*, Cotta, 1914 or from *Vom Deutschen Volk zum Deutschen Staat* by Paul Joachimsen (University of Munich), Teubner, 1915, to show how this body of influential men, to whom the mobilisation of the higher grade of intelligence was entrusted, went at their task of prolonging the first mad enthusiasm, of universalising the will-to-fight. The very fact that they make no attempt to explain, much less to deplore, carries with it its own explanation. For while the addresses ostensibly bore on the situation today, most of the references in substantiation are to the Germany of an earlier day. Their philosophy is built out of a tradition that in the course of a

century and a half has never suffered revision or emendation but has ever bulked larger until by its very weight it carries conviction.

The moral and philosophic code formulated on Kant and extending through Fichte, Hegel, Bismarck and Treitschke down to Nietzsche represents a crescendo of the appeal to force and a diminuendo of the appeal to reason. Kant planned for the elimination of war, as war ruined civilization. Fichte approved of the war of 1813 from highly idealistic motives, as a fight for existence. To be sure, the Prussians were then animated largely by the same revanche sentiment that they find so culpable in the French today. At the mid-century period, Hegel's abstract state was not so much a substitute for Kant as a sublimation of Kant. "Hegel posited the law of strife with a positive proviso against the elimination of war, which he regarded as medicinal." (J. M. Robertson, *The Germans*, 1916, p. 252.) Bismarck administered this "medicine" whenever he deemed that the body politic had need of it. Yet even Bismarck is on record as having said that he could conceive of no contingency that would involve him in a war that should open with a breach of neutrality. After Bismarck came Treitschke with his "Preussen über alles" creed. Fichte the philosopher left his cool and contemplative realms and became Fichte the patriot just for the time that his country needed him. Similarly, Josiah Royce, in his *Philosophy of Loyalty*, sounded the patriotic note only because he felt that American ideals were in need of reassertion. But Treitschke was eternally rattling the sabre and, what was worse, he made the rattling sound like music to the ears of the Prussians. Finally came Nietzsche, with the glorification of war as the mother of supermen. He cannot be accounted for on the basis of patriotism as he was a Pole and hated the Prussians and their Nationalism. Richard Meyer, whose *History of Literature* was quoted above, says that the Nietzsche cult began to wane about 1905 and had no great power in 1913 when Meyer's book was written. And yet a German pamphlet records that the favorite books with the men at the front are the Bible,

Faust and Thus spake Zarathustra! To be sure, this book affects one with a milder form of Nietzscheism and the soldiers have further diluted it with the humane culture of Goethe and the love and charity of the New Testament. The professors at home found the undiluted essence of Nietzsche more stimulating and even more palatable.

*Preparedness through education.* Every warring nation has given evidence that it realizes the truth of the axiom that true preparedness begins in the schools. The English aphorism that Waterloo was won on the playing-ground of Eton is matched by the German statement that their school-masters won the Franco-Prussian war. It is in France, however, that the most systematic and thorough-going efforts have been made to train the youth into a spirit of readiness to die for their country. Copious illustrations of support of this may be found in *Patriots in the Making* (1916) by J. F. Scott, who has made a careful study of recent educational history in France and Germany, of the text-books employed, of the school curricula and of the official enactments bearing on the aims and methods of teaching love of country. It seems to be true that the French have been actuated by a burning desire for revanche. In the main this has been critical, rational, intelligent and honest, only occasionally sounding the chauvinistic note. Naturally, the Germans maintain that the system inaugurated by Fichte has been kept on the same high plane. Scott sums up the German situation as follows: (1) Patriotism has been taught in connection with various studies and throughout all grades of instruction. (2) The school has fostered belief in the monarchical principle and a devoted loyalty to the Hohenzollern dynasty. Doctrines deemed dangerous to the present form of government have been combated. (3) Education has tended to develop national egoism through a glorification of German civilization and German achievements, and a failure to make allowance for shortcomings. (4) The school has toyed with the vision of a greater national destiny, suggesting the hope of increased power on land and sea. (5) This apotheosis of Teutonism which has characterized German



education has naturally been accompanied by a disposition to ignore or disparage other nations.

The French and the German systems are thus contrasted by Scott:

In Germany education has been used to fortify monarchical rule, whereas in France it has served to weaken the desire for one-man power. As far as education is a factor in national life, Germany has probably secured greater docility in her people, though not necessarily greater loyalty, than has France. . . . The teaching of patriotism in Germany is less formal, less didactic than in France, and so perhaps even more inspiring for the hour of victory. There are two respects in which the patriotic education of the French has been of a character less dangerous to world peace than that of Germany. In the first place, the official programs and consequently the text-book writers of France have laid emphasis on the defensive aim of the country's military preparations. The supreme necessity of repelling invasion has been constantly reiterated, while there has been a disposition to decry chauvinism. In Germany, on the other hand, there seems to have been a tendency to glorify the military spirit for its own sake. This would naturally lead to chauvinism. Secondly, a greater degree of national egoism is to be found in the text-books of the empire than in those of the republic.

This summary will serve as an excellent basis for our study of German educational literature that has appeared since the war began. To do the Germans full justice, we must take cognizance of another factor in their reaction. For some years previous to 1914 representative Germans of all classes had been conducting a determined drive on their educational system, from top to bottom. Organizations like the Munich Freie Studentenschaft criticised the quality of the work done by university students and professors, and educational authorities in general asked for a redistribution of the emphasis on various subjects taught in secondary schools. Some reforms were introduced but it was not until the war began that the immense obstacles of tradition and formalism were removed. Thereupon the far-seeing reformers seized the opportunity to urge vigorously the long-sought improvements. As we shall see, they sounded the patriotic note too loudly. It must be remembered, however, that all the literature I



refer to dates from the first six months of the war; subsequent writings, inaccessible because of the blockade, must certainly have taken a more moderate tone. And yet even after making proper discount for the excitement occasioned by the first days of the war and after making further discount for the reformer's tendency to overstate his case, there still remains an excessive amount of intemperate swashbuckling, enough to show that no department of French and German instruction is in such great need of a change in methods of presentation as this very subject of patriotism. The pedagogy of patriotism has addressed itself to the "roaring lion" aspect of human psychology, pacifism to the "sucking dove"; the true patriot will discover a middle stage that will appeal less to the emotional and more to the intellectual and, if possible, to the devotional sides of human nature.

Most of the discussion of the war as it bears on educational problems is encumbered, like the more purely controversial literature, with a husk of self-glorification that must be stripped off before one can get at the fruit. I shall give an abstract of some of the more concrete ideas and follow that with quotations from three books intended for use with classes in history.

*In general.* The keynote of the instruction must be a militant nationalism—*Deutschtum über alles*. "The most important impulse for future guidance that pedagogy can draw from the war is the accentuation of Germanism. The schools must foster an inclination for everything German. Honor will demand that we meet our educational needs from our own resources." (From Alois Fischer, "Die höhere Schule nach dem Weltkrieg," in the collection of *Beiträge* edited by J. Norrenberg, Teubner, 1916, hereinafter referred to as *Beiträge*). "By reason of the circumstance which constrains us to see in every adult male the warrior ready for the battlefield and in every youth the potential soldier, we must assign to women a more abundant share in the guardianship of the national resources, freeing the male for his particular task. Every effort must be made to oppose the feminine tendency to

admire foreign ideas and customs. Plans should be made in times of peace such that every woman may at once, upon the order to mobilize, take the particular place assigned to her" (H. Borbein, "Higher Education of Girls," *Beiträge*). "After peace comes we can by no means look forward to an interval of rest, but rather to a long or even permanent period of preparation for war, in which we must speed up our spiritual and moral resources to the same high potential as our economic resources" (Paul Lorentz, "Das Trugbild der Allgemeinbildung," *Beiträge*).

*Instruction in various subjects. History.* Official Prussian enactment of April 1, 1915, in part: Every opportunity must be sought to make the pupils realize the great events of the day, to explain the economic necessities, insofar as they are involved, and to foster a will to see the war through to the end. September 2, 1915: The history taught in Quinta henceforth shall be a continuation of the German history taught in Sexta.

In observing this call for more contemporary history, let chauvinism be as foreign as the word itself (A. Epey, *Die Schule*, 1916).

Restrict the time given to unessential facts. Call attention to the restrictive measures and mortification which we have suffered at the hands of other countries (Jantzen, *Von Deut. Erziehung*).

History must no longer be an accessory of culture, a by-study; it must be a major study in the fullest sense. Let the young people have all the German history they can absorb! Let no foreign cult insinuate itself into the innermost sanctuaries of German culture! (H. Gaudig, 1915. *Ausblicke in die Zukunft der deut. Schule*, Teubner, 1915).

History teaching should lay chief stress on recent times and do everything to foster patriotic inspiration. F. Neubauer, *Geschicht und Staatsbürgerkunde*).

*International law.* Before going into details, let me say a word or two as to Germany's violation of Belgium's neutrality. In his speech of August 4 the Chancellor gives the best possible defense. He admits that international law was violated. But he shows that this was only in the face of necessity. Until this time Germany had always observed international law. . . . It was not for base gain or territory that we broke the law, but the necessity of defending out interests. (Mentions Brussels documents). The German government holds that the formulation of such plans was in itself a breach of neutrality, so that Belgium could not ask Germany to respect the agreement (Wehberg, *Das Völkerrecht im Unterricht*, Gotha, 1915).

*Modern Languages.* Ministerial enactment of November 6,

1914: Next to history probably no department offers so much opportunity as modern languages to get into actual relation with the great events of the war, to teach them to the young . . . . . Wherever the armies push forward in the West, in Belgium, on the Eastern front, they enter old German cultural regions that preserve in their language and customs some memory of the former glory of the Empire.

Insufficient attention is paid to our own language. In Untertertia and Obertertia German is taught only two hours per week. . . . . We should reduce the number of hours given to modern languages and distribute them among German geography and history. Let us not send out daughters to foreign boarding schools or put them under the charge of foreign governesses. Such action prevents the growth of a healthy patriotism (Jantzen *Von Deutscher Schule und Erziehung*).

No more delving into grammar! Keep out the study of foreign languages; the German youth must be conserved for Deutschtum. We can learn much about the other countries without their language, particularly the economic side, which to us is the most important. (Gaudig *Ausblicke in die Zukunft der deut. Schule*. This attitude is the exception, not the rule).

It is as necessary as ever to study foreign languages but more stress should be laid on political evolution and on history (Theodor Engwer, "Modern Languages," *Beiträge*).

With the study of the state should go more attention to the vernacular. The patriotic views of Arndt, Fichte, Jahn and Kleist must be allowed to have their effect upon the pupils. Our great historians, in particular Heinrich von Treitschke, have not merited the scant courtesy shown them (Friedr. Neubauer).

Do not portray literature as something remote from life. Exclude the dilettante spirit and aim at inspiration. The Chancellor's speech admitting the violation of Belgium might be turned into verse:

Am Niederrhein will schon der Feind  
Zerschmettern unsre Flanke.  
Ob tausendmal es unrecht scheint,  
Wir brachen Belgiens Schranke!

Und reparieren hinterher  
Ihm gerne jeden Schaden,  
Weil es der reine Unsinn war,  
Das Heer im Blut zu baden.

(Witkop, *On Teaching German*.)

*Geography.* Even the eleven and twelve year old scholars can learn from a map that in marching to the North, away from the heights along the Rhine, our way led through more level Belgium and Northern France. A war geography must also teach meteorology, how the West Flanders campaign was brought

to a halt by the windy, sloppy weather and how wet weather blocked the march to Warsaw (F. Lampe, *On Teaching Geography*)

Other pamphlets tell how arithmetic, drawing, domestic science may be put on a war footing.

Several text-books have already appeared that endeavor to comply with the enactments concerning the teaching of history. I quote a few passages from three:

*Der Weltkrieg 1914/15 in der Volksschule.* Methodische Handreichung von Franziska Peil, Dritte Auflage, Oktober, 1915. 106 pages.

*Der Weltkrieg in der Volksschule und in den Anfangsklassen höherer Schulen,* von Sigismund Rauh. I Teil, Göttingen, 1915. 133 pages.

*Bundestreue, Chronik des Weltkrieges 1914-15.* Für die Jugend und das Volk hgg. von Gerhard Hennes und Laurenz Kiesgen. Münster, November, 1914

*The underlying causes.* Peil: As our country had grown so rich and efficient that it was taking its place in the markets of the world, England grew jealous and planned to destroy us. . . . France wants revenge on Germany because of Alsace-Lorraine. Russia knows that the way to Vienna is by way of Berlin, so they look on us with hatred.

Rauh: You see how our principal enemies began to war against us because of envy. The English through jealousy of our prosperity, the French through jealousy of our fame in war and the Russians through envy of our beautiful land. And they all said: 'We must crush Germany so that there will be nothing left of her.' Then the English would be the only merchants, and the French would be the best soldiers that everybody would be afraid of and the Russians would get more land out of which they could squeeze money.

Bundestreue The shopkeepers across the Channel felt attacked in their most sacred possession, their pocket-books. . . . The hatred passed all bounds "The damned Germans" (sic), said the statesman, the manufacturer, the merchant, who were unable to compete with Germany's efficiency, "we must humiliate Germany, take away her political power, break her army, smash her fleet."

*The immediate cause.* Peil: Austria sent an ultimatum to Serbia demanding investigation of the crime, punishment of the guilty and an official declaration that the conspiracies against Austria should cease. Serbia's answer came but it was unsatisfactory.

Rauh: Austria said: "We demand that the conspirators be given a real trial; to make sure that this is done we shall send some judges from Austria-Hungary." . . . The Russian

emperor said he would not permit that. But Francis Joseph said that was none of his business. Thereupon Russia threatened war.

Bundestreue: Austria demanded an honest investigation of the crime, with the assistance of the Austrian authorities. Serbia's reply was evasive and absolutely unsatisfactory.

*Belgium.* Peil: Belgium is a neutral state which troops should not cross. Yet our troops crossed the border and demanded free passage to France. How did that happen? We *had* to go to France and Belgium was the best way for us to go. Moreover, it was known that there were French officers in Belgium. Necessity required that we take the only open road. We did not want to fight any battles, we wanted to go through because we had to. We told the Belgians so, perfectly frankly; but they were struck with blindness and did not see the honesty of our purpose. Foolishly they rejected our proffer of friendship. Indeed they seemed to hate the sight of the Germans, a fact that was incomprehensible to us. But now we know that all kinds of plans had been made with France and England, long before.

Rauh: Our Kaiser said to Bethmann-Hollweg: "We know that the Belgians have made secret arrangements with the French and English. Should we show consideration to such hypocrites? We can win more quickly if we go through Belgium, so we'll simply go through."

Bundestreue: Belgium violated her own neutrality. Then after she refused to let us go through after promising that she should not suffer economically, we simply could not pay any more attention to her supposed neutrality.

*The conquest of Belgium.* Peil: Liège was taken in honest, open warfare. Our soldiers regretted the sacrifices that had to be made but rejoiced at their victory. But their joy was diminished by reason of the constant trouble with armed citizens, the snipers. No soldier's life was safe; from behind trees and from houses the snipers shot in blind rage, not even respecting the Red Cross. We had to resort to stringent means to put a stop to this

Rauh: When our soldiers entered Belgium and defeated their army they thought they had nothing more to fear. And so they were very kind to the citizens and women and children and did no harm to them. But the Belgians were tricky and deceitful; even women and children seized weapons and shot German soldiers. . . . All Belgians found in such houses were shot. Of course, we took pity on some of the wretches and let them get away when they howled and yelled. Our enemies, especially the lying English said we had murdered citizens and burned their cities, but they did not add that the Belgians began the murdering and suffered the just punishment.

*The Marne.* Rauh: When children become spoiled, their fathers see that they learn to behave. Grown up people are often like

children. Now who is the father that has to be stern with them?

Pupil: That is the good Lord.

Teacher: Correct. Well, in September, 1914, the dear Germans had become spoiled. Every day new victories, new fortresses taken, twenty or thirty kilometers covered on the march to Paris. Everyone in Berlin was out in the streets cheering. They thought they could ask the Lord to let this keep up. Then all of a sudden the good Lord cried: "Halt!" Then the situation changed. General Joffre had collected more troops than we had and we had to yield ground and the victories stopped. . . . Then the good, dear Germans at home had to practise patience, because the stern father in heaven does not relax in his purpose. That was a good thing for us. Anybody can cheer when things are going finely but it takes a man to bear up under danger and trials. The good Lord thought to himself: "I wonder if my Germans are real men of this type?" So he put the Germans to the test. The Germans gritted their teeth and stood the test successfully.

There could be no object in quoting at greater length. One of the accounts calls the battle of the Marne a "masterpiece of strategy," the others minimize its importance. Bundestreue says that the French and English were the first to use asphyxiating gases.

The gaily illustrated books for children are listed as "fiction" but they serve much the same purpose as the histories. Only a thin thread of narrative holds together the chapters that follow the experiences of the heroic soldiers. Undoubtedly, every warring nation has produced many such books, chiefly for the holiday trade.

Up to this point all the evidence has gone to show that the first mad enthusiasm of the German people was inchoate and formless but acquired depth and breadth through the efforts of the eminent professors, epigones of Treitschke and Nietzsche, and then acquired permanence through the capacity of the lesser professors to pass the enthusiasm on to the younger generation. In his keynote speech the emperor called for complete moral and physical support. The immensely impressive response appears to the German mind, now thoroughly mobilized, as *Begeisterung*, *Erhebung*, terms which might fitly be employed to describe the spirit in which the crusaders responded to the



exhortations of Peter the Hermit. The present-day Germans have not had to turn back the pages of history as far as Peter the Hermit, however. His embodiment is found in Fichte, while the sentiment animating the crusader is found again in the *Addresses to the German Nation*. "Es siegt die Begeisterung über den, der nicht begeistert ist" was Fichte's recipe for the salvation of the state. A hundred years later Fichte again becomes the most-quoted German author. "Kriegstechnik," a sort of manual of warfare, interprets the above quotation as the clue to success, adding: "Flaming enthusiasm for prince and Fatherland shall thrill each and every German." The net result is best expressed by Dewey in his *German Philosophy and Politics*, page 81: "Patriotism, national feeling, national consciousness are common enough facts. But nowhere save in Germany in the earlier nineteenth century, have these sentiments and impulses been transformed by deliberate nurture into a mystic cult." Let me remind the reader that the Germans of today regard themselves as reincarnations of the Germans of 1813. Patriotism is still the mystic cult that it was a century ago!

What does the war literature show as to the relations between religion and patriotism? Let us take first the didactic literature.

As one might expect, the Religionstunde in school is to be employed in inculcating patriotism on the Biblical analogies.

The Old Testament, representing Israel as a little state fighting for existence, is of greater value than the New as a fund of ideas that bear on race and patriotism. Draw upon the Apocryphal books of the Maccabees. Let the younger pupils merely study Old Testament stories, the older pupils learn the application of these stories to Germany in contradistinction to, say, France. Almost all the injunctions of the decalog may somehow be brought into relation to the war. Thus: *First commandment*: How the soldiers and those at home fear God. *Second*: Prayer for victory and peace. *Fourth*: Religious services on the field of battle. *Fifth*: Authority and State; duties of citizens and soldiers to king and country. *Sixth*: Giving one's self for the country; Red Cross; first aid. *Seventh*: The sacrifice that women make in giving their husbands to the cause (!). *Eighth*: Respect



of property. *Ninth*: Our opponents' campaign of lies; fairness in judging the enemy. *Tenth* (Thou shalt not covet): Omitted (!). . . . In the New Testament teach the life and letters of Paul; moral values such as courage, joy of combat, endurance, self-sacrifice. To avoid the danger of moral perceptions becoming blunted teach orderliness, discipline, moderation, truth, simplicity; avoid craft, deceit, cunning, however, permissible such may be at the front. (Spanuth, *Der Religionsunterricht*.)

Most of the writers adopt the same general tone as Spanuth. It is interesting to see the general disapproval of "songs of hate," not so much because they are wicked as because they weaken the soldier's moral fibre, accordingly his efficiency. The analogy to God's "chosen people" is rather common. Germany's "false gods" were the material things of this earth. An almost invariable note in the religious literature, didactic or sermons, is that the war will bring about a general "Selbstläuterung," a "Reinigung." Aristotle said the purpose of tragedy was to purify the emotions; the Germans declare that the war, as the greatest of all tragedies, will effect the complete purification of the German character. This note must have come from Nietzsche who praised war as the transvaluer of all values.

One of the most remarkable books of the war is Ernst Haeckel's *Ewigkeit: Weltkriegsgedanken über Leben und Tod, Religionsentwicklungslehre*, Berlin, 1915, 128 pages. In this sequel to his *Riddle of the Universe*, he portrays 'war' as the answer to the riddle: The old familiar monistic doctrines are restated in a higher and shriller key; the message, undeniably sensational in its earlier form, is now almost obliterated by the crimson stain on every page, in almost every line. I quote without further comment:

The underestimation of human life: Every day we read of the deaths of many hopeful youths; we read of families left fatherless through the loss of splendid men in the prime of health. Such losses are especially hard for Germans to bear, as the spiritual and cultural attainments of the Germans and Austrians are higher than those of the enemy, hence the average value of life is far greater on our side than among the enemy recruited from mercenaries and from the lower classes of every clime and color.

Germany and England: The consequences of the world-war, criminally invoked by England—the greatest crime in the history

of the world—are so terrible and will inflict such deep wounds on humanity that a reconciliation between Germany and these false English fratricides is not to be thought of, as yet. At least the present generation of Continental Europe, which has been a witness every day for fifteen months of England's barbaric and infamous method of conducting war, of her unparalleled slaughter, of her shameless lying and hypocrisy, her contemptible treatment of wounded and prisoners, cannot possibly extend to her the hand of reconciliation. A new generation must arise before morals and tolerance, private rights and international rights (both trodden under feet by England and her allies) are re-established.

England's illusion of greatness. When the well-known declaration of ninety-three reputable German scholars tore apart the meshes of a network of lies and exposed the true nature of the outbreak of the war, one hundred and twenty English scholars answered with a counter declaration whose incredible representations can be explained only as evidence of the familiar English illusion. It is indeed a fact that the greater part of the English population are in the pathological condition of believing that they alone are the real furtherers of culture and civilization; an immeasurable national pride that is increased by their ignorance of the real accomplishments of other nations.

The terms of peace. The newly-annexed territories shall be germanised thoroughly and regardlessly (*energisch und rücksichtslos*), but at the same time with judgment and prudence, or else at any rate they shall be made partakers of German culture and civilization.

*The share of the preachers.* There has been a small-sized deluge of sermons, many of them bound together under one cover and stamped on the outside with an apparently official Prussian cross. These sermons had already been delivered from pulpits, so that it is hard to see why they are thus authenticated, or even published at all, unless they are intended to serve as propaganda, to inspire the unanimity for which the Kaiser called. They run the whole gamut of feeling, from sincere indorsement of the Sermon on the Mount down to the ragings of the furor teutonicus in its most malignant form. I shall not quote from them at this place inasmuch as a complete exhibit may be found in a book that came to my hands after the present article was set up in galley-proof: *Hurrah and Hallelujah, a Documentation by J. P. Bang, with an introduction by Ralph Connor, Translated from the Danish by Jessie Bröchner*, Doran, New York, 1917, 234 pages. Bang has assembled an extraordi-

nary amount of evidence to show the German hatred and contempt for other nations and, sadly enough, it is the preachers who furnish the capstone to his argument. The German mind is now completely, efficiently mobilised!

The purport of this whole paper is embodied in a quotation from W. H. Dawson's *What's Wrong with Germany?* (p. 65):

Another collateral result (of the conception of the State) has been the perversion of patriotism. This, too, has been officialized and governmentalized until it has lost the old idealistic meaning. As the state machine manufactures opinion, so it manufactures patriotism, or rather the spirit and sentiment which do service for it under a system which identifies patriotism with slavish acceptance of the official policy, and loyalty with mechanical adulation of the sovereign. Today patriotism is 'taught' in the schools as part of the recognized curriculum, like grammar and geography; not only by a means of a skilfully devised rotation of national celebrations, but by systematic perversion of history.

To substantiate this and to show the working out of the whole principle, I quote from the *Schriften der Münchner Freien Studentenschaft*, Heft 4, *Der Krieg und die Jugend*, von G. Wyncken:

The war will cost a quarter of a million in dead—about the number of infants who die every year and who might be saved. It will cost 30,000,000 marks—about the sum spent for alcohol in ten years. Is war "out there" any worse than the distress in times of peace, than the disparity between poverty and riches? Soldiers suffer for us, but thousands suffer for us in times of peace and we accept it without comment. So was our peace really better than war? I do not believe so. Why, our peace was itself war, a struggle for existence. . . . In no way do the people work so well for the state as in war. To the youth war is not a political but an ethical experience. . . . The war is not for a place in the sun but for the higher transcendent values, a holy war that does not look to man or to posterity for indorsement, but on high.

Here again is the haunting "chosen people" motif. That an extraordinary parallel to the People of Israel may be drawn is shown in the following quotation, written before the war and with no reference to Germany:

Their unique situations, surrounded on all sides by warlike and hostile communities, wedged in between empires, demanded from the Jews a combination of qualities unparalleled in the history of the world. In that sense at least may they be regarded as a chosen people.

That they emerged at all from this ordeal, must be ascribed to the perpetual haunting sense of God's presence, which alone could have sufficed to give them the necessary cohesion. . . . The belief in God always went hand in hand with patriotism. . . . The prophets looked to ultimate restoration of Israel, purged by suffering. Even when they had lost their independence, even amid all the leveling influences of Greek and Roman civilization, the Jews preserved their faith and character, and bequeathed not only the heroic example of the Maccabees, but the mellow and gentle wisdom of the Rabbis. . . . We see, by the example of these great peoples, how essential is the bond of a common personality, a communion of souls uniting the past with the future (*The History of English Patriotism*, Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, 2 vols., 1913).

A *communion* of souls uniting the past with the future; once she can bring this about Germany's perpetuation is assured; that she is being threatened with destruction is in the last analysis due to the fact that her *Weltanschauung* represents a *conflict* of souls—and the dynastic state is the cause of the conflict.